DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 836 HE 002 077

TITLE	Needs: Socio-Economic, Manpower, Regional; Report of Task Force I to the Connecticut Commission for Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Connecticut Commission for Higher Education, Hartford.
PUB DATE	Dec 70
NOTE	92p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Activism, *Educational Needs, Enrollment Trends, *Higher Education, Planning, Responsibility, *Socioeconomic Influences, State Government, Student Characteristics, *Universal Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Connecticut

ABSTRACT

The report of Task Force I deals with the needs for higher education in Connecticut arising out of current and projected socioeconomic conditions. The orientation of the Task Force was that some form of post-secondary education should be available to all students to the extent that they might benefit from such education, and that economic and geographic factors should not inhibit a student's entry into an institution of higher education. The recommendations reflect this orientation. Section I of the report discusses the problems facing higher education, particularly student unrest and the causes of student frustration. Section II deals with the socioeconomic factors that determine how current needs are being served and what new demands may develop during the next decade. The factors considered are: (1) population, including numbers, density, age, ethnic and racial characteristics, education and personal income; (2) economy, including projected manpower needs; and (3) accessibility to the state's institutions of higher education. Section III deals with enrollment trends in the different types of institutions of higher education, and Section IV discusses the 22 recommendations. The last section reviews the causes of student unrest and suggests appropriate responses. (AF)

ED048836

NEEDS: SOCIO-ECONOMIC, MANPOWER, REGIONAL

Report of

Task Force I

to the

Connecticut Commission for Higher Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

December 1970

HE002077

1

The Connecticut Commission for Higher Education wishes to express its gratitude to the Task Force members who prepared this report. In June 1970 the Commission established four Task Forces with broad representation from the educational, business and civic communities of the State. Each Task Force was asked to consider a different aspect of higher education. Their separate reports express the conclusions and recommendations of Task Force members exclusively. They are not necessarily the views of the Commission for Higher Education.

ED048836

December 8, 1970

Mr. Donald H. McGannon, Chairman
Commission for Higher Education
340 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, Connecticut

Dear Mr. McGannon:

The members of Task Force I are pleased to submit this report on the needs for higher education in the State of Connecticut arising out of current and projected socio-economic conditions.

Our orientation from the beginning has been that some form of post-secondary education should be available to all students to the extent that they might benefit from such education, and that economic and geographic factors should not inhibit any student's entry into our institutions of higher education. Our recommendations, we believe, reflect this point of view.

Among the rapidly changing social and economic factors that demand major adjustments in our institutions of higher education are the following:

A growing population whose most significant gains are in the numbers of 18-to-24 year olds and in the proportion of minorities, especially in the cities.

Rising expectations of individuals, particularly among those at the lower end of the socio-economic scale.

Indiscriminate pressures on young people to continue their formal schooling without interruption for 15 to 20 years in order to earn an academic degree.

Growing dissatisfaction among students with the academic offerings and requirements of our institutions of higher education.

Because we are aware that Task Forces II, III and IV are dealing with structure, financing and evaluation, we have tried to confine our deliberation to the socio-economic needs, touching on the other topics only in a general way when pertinent. We realize, however, that our recommendations cannot be divorced from the considerations to which the other three task forces are addressing themselves, and that some of our suggestions, in fact, may prove unfeasible when weighed against these other factors.

We realize, for example, the effect on costs of rising enrollments and the broadening of educational opportunities and offerings. We have also mentioned frequently in our discussion the question of how to broaden ad-

missions policies without lowering standards and making our colleges into high schools and remedial centers. We have not, however, attempted to grapple with these and similar questions in depth, but have elected to leave the matter of specific cost projections to Task Force III and the question of implementing changes in structure or methods of evaluating performance to Task Forces II and IV.

Primarily we have addressed ourselves to the six charges outlined in Category A, since the three short-range charges in Category B dealing with regional needs, are being undertaken by consultants. Several visiting experts talked with us about alternate approaches to traditional education as well as about socio-economic conditions and projections.

Our procedure has been to survey the available studies and reports containing socio-economic data as well as those analyzing student unrest (see Chapter V). Our purpose was to

1) relate Connecticut's problems to the overall national scene;
2) avoid duplicating research done by others;
3) avail ourselves of the recommendations of other concerned groups, and to
4) consider the applicability to Connecticut institutions of innovations being tried elsewhere.

At first, we discussed holding quasi-public hearings on Charge 6: structures for assuring academic freedom, right of dissent, and continuity of learning in higher education in Connecticut, and recommendations for implementing the above. We decided, however, in view of the several studies that have already been done on student unrest, to rely on these reports plus testimony given at a July 1 hearing of the Subcommittee on Higher Education of the Interim Legislative Committee of the Connecticut General Assembly, focusing on the student unrest at the University of Connecticut. Task Force members supplemented this with attendance at the July 22 legislative hearing on student unrest at the State Colleges and with a review by a Task Force I subcommittee of the positions taken by other groups that have studied student unrest. This subcommittee, composed of Herbert Cohen, Bridgeport attorney, Laura Johnson, president of Hartford College for Women and Vivian Sykes, student, University of Connecticut, have summarized the recommendations made by various other committees and proposed a stance for Connecticut.

Task Force I has held seven meetings with an average attendance of twelve (plus visitors). Our discussions have been wide-ranging and have touched on a number of basic questions we could not answer adequately, such as: How much should institutions influence the aspirations, goals and choices of individuals? How much guidance should be given young people as to fields to enter, job openings that may occur, training they will need? Or should we simply spread the whole potpourri in front of them and let them choose?

Another area that we believe deserves serious exploration is: How can we teach students to learn, to solve problems, to apply knowledge and skills from one field to another, in order for them to remain productive in a world

that is changing rapidly not only technologically but also attitudinally?

Many questions such as these arose which demand further study. We hope, however, that the results of our deliberations, as reported, and the recommendations we have made will be useful to the CHE in developing policies and programs to serve the needs of all Connecticut's citizens adequately and economically.

Respectfully,

Edwin L. Caldwell

Edwin Caldwell,
Chairman

F O R E W O R D

This is the first of four Task Force reports on higher education in Connecticut. The reports are entitled:

I. NEEDS: SOCIO-ECONOMIC, MANPOWER, REGIONAL

II. FUNCTION, SCOPE AND STRUCTURE

III. FINANCING

IV. QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE PERFORMANCE AND ACHIEVEMENT

Each Task Force report contains a section that describes the development of the present state system of higher education. In the report of Task Force I, this background material appears in the Appendix beginning on page 63.

The charges to the four Task Forces from the Commission for Higher Education suggested subjects for possible consideration. They did not, however, limit the scope of the discussions. Task Force members were encouraged to make recommendations for any actions they felt would strengthen Connecticut's system of higher education.

A definition of Task Force I's assignment, a list of the Task Force members and a brief summary of their recommendations follow. The complete report begins on page one.

TASK FORCE I ASSIGNMENT

Connecticut's Needs: Socio-economic, Manpower, Regional

Definition of Task

Higher education seeks to satisfy a number of needs: the aspiration of the individual, the evolving requirements of society, the manpower needs of the State and of its various regions. In order to identify what the total demands on higher education will be, it is, therefore, important to make best estimates of the social and economic trends of Connecticut, estimates of the demand for higher education as reflected in past enrollment trends and future expectations, and estimates of what new kinds of manpower will be needed. In addition, it is imperative that an estimate be made on the regional needs for higher education for the immediate period, as well as the long-range.

In addition to the charges given to all of the task forces, specific assignments of responsibility to this task force follow.

Charges

Category A (Total Charge)

The task force should analyze and suggest possible alternatives regarding the following:

1) The projected socio-economic trends for Connecticut in 1970 and 1980;

2) The education derivatives of the above identified trends:

   a. Major changes anticipated in manpower needs;
   b. Gross manpower demands;
   c. Major fields of endeavor in higher education which should be expanded, modified, or eliminated;

3) Academic programs needed: note at what academic levels, institutions and geographic locations such programs should be mounted;

4) Required new institutions;

5) Regional needs if any that are common in the State (e.g., liberal arts, general education) and those that are unique. Indicate what, if any, (a) new institutions should be developed, (b) programs should be expanded, or (c) new relationships developed;

6) Structures for assuring academic freedom, right of dissent, and continuity of learning in higher education in Connecticut, and recommendations for implementing above.

Category B (Short-Range)

Within the charges noted above, the following ad hoc needs exists:

1) The Commission must make recommendations by January, 1971, regarding expansion of higher educational opportunities for the Meriden-Wallingford-Southington-Cheshire area. Such recommendations, including the identification of proposals to be implemented, are to be made by the Commission to the Governor and the General Assembly prior to January 1, 1971, (Special Act 812). This is one example demonstrating why the immediate mounting of an analysis of regional needs becomes especially vital.

2) The Board of Trustees of the University of Connecticut, under Special Act 249, was charged to "cause the branch of said university at Stamford to be expanded into a four-year, full curriculum college, commencing with the fall semester, 1971."

   In order to implement this mandate, the University of Connecticut has had an advisory committee reviewing this matter and has requested and received $20,000 from the Commission for Higher Education to recommend modes for implementation of this mandate.

3) The following is one example of the need to establish the exact role of the higher education system in meeting the needs of government for manpower training and development. A resolution passed during the 1969 Session of the General Assembly specified that the Commission for Higher Education "shall develop an overall education program in the field of police science and law enforcement, including expansion of programs leading to the associate in arts degree and the development of four-year courses and post graduate work and shall make a report of such study with recommendations for necessary legislation to the 1971 session of the General Assembly on or before January 15, 1971." Steps for implementing this study are being taken in collaboration with the Connecticut Planning Committee on Criminal Justice.

MEMBERS OF TASK FORCE I

CHAIRMAN
Dr. Edwin L. Caldwell, Vice President
Connecticut Bank and Trust Company
Hartford, Connecticut

Dr. Frederick Adams
School of Allied Health
University of Connecticut
Hartford, Connecticut

Mr. Joseph Bober, Secretary-Treasurer
Connecticut State Labor Council AFL-CIO
Hamden, Connecticut

Mr. Horace Brown, Director
Office of State Planning
State Department of Finance and Control
Hartford, Connecticut

Mr. David S. Clarke, President
Naugatuck Valley Industrial Council
Waterbury, Connecticut

Mr. Herbert Cohen, Attorney
Cohen and Wolf
Bridgeport, Connecticut

Mr. Milton P. DeVane
Attorney
New Haven, Connecticut

Mrs. Delores Graham
University of Hartford
Director of Urban Education
West Hartford, Connecticut

Miss Laura Johnson, President
Hartford College for Women
Hartford, Connecticut

Mr. Raymond LeBrun
Student
Hartford State Technical College
East Hartford, Connecticut

Mr. Lucien L. Lombardi, Director
Board of Trustees
State Technical Colleges
Hartford, Connecticut

Mr. C. Perrie Phillips, Commissioner
State Personnel Department
Hartford, Connecticut

Dr. Joseph Murphy
Associate Commissioner
Division of Vocational Education
Connecticut Education Department
Hartford, Connecticut

Mr. Perry Roehm, Exec. Vice-President
Barden Corporation
Danbury, Connecticut

Miss Vivian Sykes, Student
University of Connecticut
Crandall A.
Storrs, Connecticut

Mr. Bruce N. Torrell
Division Executive Vice-President
Pratt & Whitney Aircraft
East Hartford, Connecticut

Mrs. Velma A. Adams
Task Force Consultant
40 West Elm St.
Greenwich, Connecticut

Early Research by
Mr. Edwin Matesky
University of Hartford
Hartford, Connecticut

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Task Force I has concentrated on Charges One through Six in Category A, while the short-range questions in Category B are being answered by consultants.

We have dealt rather thoroughly with Charges One and Six. Our responses to Charges Two, Three and Four were tempered by the limited amount of projections available regarding specific occupations and by the time lag attendant upon such data. It becomes obvious that further ongoing studies of occupational needs must be undertaken by the Commission for Higher Education and other planning agencies before programs can be recommended and counseling updated to reflect the employment trends of the next decade.

Our responses, therefore, to Charges Two, Three and Four tend to be somewhat general. With the limitations of time and information available responses to Charge 2 C have been in the form of recommended approaches rather than specific educational programs.

We have interpreted Charge 4, "new institutions", to mean also new modes of delivering education. An example is our recommendation that an external degree program be developed.

With regard to Charge 5, a number of our general recommendations, while applicable statewide, can best be implemented on a regional basis. In some cases, such as expanded counseling services, we have recommended Regional Counseling Centers to serve not only students but also those no longer in school.

The following is a brief summary of the recommendations of Task Force I, which are described in more detail in Chapter IV, pages 33-49.

1. Find ways to encourage the timely introduction of innovations into the curriculum and into methods of operation and techniques of teaching, at least on a pilot basis.
2. Provide young people with more options for post-high school experience.
3. Adopt and promote the concept of education as a unified lifetime experience and make it easy for people to move through the system without putting barriers, in the form of unnecessary requirements, in their way.
4. Provide more opportunities and encouragement for women to be educated for the professions, government and service positions and technical jobs.
5. Avoid setting up new programs that will duplicate unnecessarily those already being offered by neighboring institutions.
6. Explore ways of achieving broad, general cooperation between public and private institutions, through consortia, contracts or other means.
7. Encourage the use of community resources off-campus to augment the resources of higher education.
8. Encourage the setting up of External Degree Program on a pilot basis.
9. Emphasize preparation for broad work categories or clusters of jobs, whenever possible, rather than for specific jobs.
10. Upgrade the image of vocational education and deepen appreciation for the idea that creativity can be expressed by means other than words.
11. Encourage a better mix of liberal arts and vocational education, varying the emphasis according to each individual's life goals.
12. Extend the training of counselors in contemporary approaches, including the use of the computer as a counseling tool. This "blanket" recommendation includes suggestions for wider dissemination of information,

introduction of counseling into the elementary grades, and greatly extended programs for training teachers and counselors for the elementary and secondary schools.

13. Make up-to-date personal counseling available to all segments of the population not just students, through regional centers, supported by a computer service. The computer would match up qualifications and preferences of applicants with the measurable characteristics and requirements of the state's institutions of higher education.

14. Appoint a study team to review admissions requirements and programs in light of the changes taking place in job requirements and personal expectations.

15. Encourage the acceptance by all institutions of higher education, but especially by the community colleges, of a certain number of students who give evidence of potential even though their background does not fall into traditional kinds of preparation.

16. Participate with other agencies, as appropriate, in ongoing studies of socio-economic trends, projections for both long-range and short-range implications for education, and a continuing review of faculty and curriculum to ascertain how they are fulfilling the needs.

17. Promote a paraprofessional career ladder that recognizes workers' capabilities and helps them to get further education while working.

18. Expand continuing education program to include more suitable courses at more locations, making the same resources available to those who cannot carry a full-time, day-time program leading to a degree as to full-time students.

19. Initiate closer working relationships with agencies in the State concerned with elementary, secondary, vocational and continuing education, in order to coordinate policies and activities, since what happens at each level of the total system affects all the others.

20. Encourage the establishment of a voluntary Faculty Service Corps to work in community service, in field projects, in overseas teaching or in other practical service positions, with volunteers returning to the campus to share their firsthand experiences with students.

21. Focus on clearing up causes rather than on formulating additional legislation for dealing with student demonstrators. No additional legislation is needed.

22. Avoid enacting new laws and statutes that are punitive or repressive in nature. Present statutes are sufficient and adequate for the protection of the colleges and the people against violence, for the punishment of offenders, and to insure due process for students.

23. Make sure students understand existing laws and then stand firm on them.

24. State definitively to all members of the community the university's policy, rules and guidelines for proper conduct.

25. Enforce discipline effectively and fairly, with academic due process.

CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS	6
III.	ENROLLMENT	20
IV.	RECOMMENDATIONS	26
V.	STANCE ON STUDENT UNREST	43
	APPENDIX	63
	Creation of Task Forces	63
	Higher Education in Connecticut	65
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	77

I. INTRODUCTION

Higher education is in trouble. The signs are all around us, in both the social and economic spheres.

Students are swarming into the colleges and rebelling at what they find there. Those who are not admitted cry "unfair." Costs of education are rising phenomenally, yet no one seems satisfied with what the money buys.

The turmoil on campus is paralleled by instability in the marketplace. Unemployment is rising. Even skilled and professional workers are finding their education obsolete in a world of rapid technological change; many of them are unable to transfer their skills to another field without additional training.

Yet everyone's expectations are rising. Demands for equality of opportunity and self-fulfillment are heard everywhere.

Attitudes and life styles are changing, too, especially among the young. But institutions change slowly. Too slowly, and this is the real challenge to higher education: to find ways to adapt more easily and quickly to the needs of its constituents--students, business and industry, and ultimately, society.

Institutions must respond to this challenge even at the risk of mistakes. Establishing that an experimental approach does not work can be as valuable as discovering a new approach that does work, if results are shared with others. At the same time, educators must guard against a myriad of wrong actions that will have irrevocable consequences.

The assignment is a tough one, but the members of Task Force I have tackled their part of it with enthusiasm.

Briefly, we have interpreted our part of the task as follows: to survey the socio-economic trends in the nation and particularly in Connecticut; to infer what these trends mean for higher education, and then to recommend actions that can be taken to meet these needs. In attempting to do this, Task Force I has made certain assumptions and agreed on certain premises as the basis for our discussions.

Higher education, we agreed, is too narrowly construed as college, and the pressure to achieve entrance to college rests on grounds that are not wholly defensible. We chose, therefore, to define higher education as post-high school education with or without a diploma.

We also agreed that higher education must be considered within the framework of total education, with kindergarten and elementary school at one end of the spectrum and adult or continuing education at the other. Our preference, in fact, is to look upon all education as continuing.

This point of view gave us a unique opportunity to consider the interrelationship of all levels of education--as presently designated--and to consider the influence each level has upon the others. Out of these discussions came our recommendations for developing closer liaison between the various levels and types of education and for lowering the barriers to transfer and advance throughout the system.

We also adopted the philosophy that Connecticut and its educational institutions have an obligation to provide some form of higher education to all who want and can benefit by it, either as an entree to meaningful, productive jobs or for greater self-fulfillment, or both.

These views gave us a chance to consider vocational and technical education in the larger context of higher education and the overall educational system. We have noted the overemphasis on verbal intelligence, and the desirability of mixing liberal arts education with technical training instead of treating the two as unrelated entities.

With regard to Charge 4--the question of the advisability of establishing new institutions--Task Force I has chosen to interpret "new institutions" broadly to include also new modes of delivering education in existing institutions,i.e. alternative approaches and innovative programs which may be possible with existing facilities and faculties.

In all of our discussions, we have tried to look at every issue in the light of student needs, rather than talking about student needs as a separate subject. Our recommendations for earlier guidance counselling--even in the elementary grades--reflects this point of view. Individual aspirations, we feel, develop early and decisions made prior to high school may be critical to later education and career choices. This recommendation also illustrates the desirability of close coordination between various levels within the total educational system.

Most of our recommendations concern the six charges in Category A of our assignment, since detailed studies of Category B are being carried on by others. Mindful of the pressure of time as well as the breadth of the task, we have tried to develop only general guidelines or principles leaving the details of implementation to be worked out by the Commission and the various institutions involved.

Relevance of student unrest

To avoid diverting the entire Task Force from considering the other five

charges, we delegated Charge 6 to a subcommittee chaired by Attorney Herbert Cohen. After extensive investigations, this subcommittee reported to the Task Force (See report, p. 43) that apart from concern about external factors such as the war, excessive militarism and governmental attitudes toward social problems, a major--if not the primary-cause of student unrest is within the college or university structure and can be relieved considerably by educators and administrators. Dissatisfaction is prevalent among students, not just among the radicals, with the academic offerings of our institutions of higher education and with the methods by which those offerings are being delivered. More specifically, the internal causes of student frustration include:

Being forced to take courses they do not want, are not adept at and in which they see no relevance;

Having to stay in school too long at one stretch with little opportunity to work or to help correct social ills;

Too few options--really only two: to go on to college or not;

Pressure from parents, teachers, employers, society to get a college degree, even for jobs which do not actually require such a degree;

Difficulty in shifting fields, in entering and leaving the system, or in changing one's direction;

Arbitrary separation of working and learning;

No knowledgement by the educational system or society that there can be self-education;

No credit--formal or informal--for learning experiences other than in courses and measured by grades;

An educational system that teaches everyone in the same way, requires

the same performance of all, and gives too little consideration to individual differences and styles of learning;

A system that by its monolithic nature, dooms some to failure if others are to succeed, and

A system that attempts to enforce parietal rules on adults 18 years or older.

These concerns of students, therefore, figured heavily in our considerations of Charges One through Five, and influenced a number of our recommendations.

II. SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS

Connecticut's higher education needs are determined by the social, economic and cultural characteristics of the State's residents and the aspirations of students and their parents. To assist us in determining how current needs are being served and what new demands may develop during the next decade, we have considered the following socio-economic factors and trends:

Population: numbers, density, age, ethnic and racial characteristics, education and personal income.

Economy: manpower needs projected for the growth industries, declining fields--including the shift from defense-oriented industries--and probable new fields of employment.

Transportation: accessibility of the State's institutions of higher education to residents.

Population

In the decade 1960-70, the population of the United States rose from 179 million to 200 million, a gain of 11.7 percent. During the same period, Connecticut's population increased approximately half a million--a rise of 18 percent--and now totals just over three million. As elsewhere in the nation, most of the growth was in the suburbs, surrounding the major centers of population.

Each of the state's three major cities--Bridgeport, Hartford and New Haven--lost residents. A notable exception to this trend is Stamford. Stamford gained more than 15,000 and passed the 100,000 mark for the first time. Danbury showed the largest percentage gain--more than 120 percent--and has approximately 40,569 residents.

The major cities' losses were more than compensated for by the overall growth in the counties in which the urban centers are located. The following tables show what has been happening numerically:

Connecticut	Estimate in millions
1960	2.5
1965	2.8
1970	3.0
(1975 projected)	(3.4)
(1980)	(3.7)

Cities	1960	1970
Bridgeport	156,784	155,359
Hartford	162,178	155,868
New Haven	152,048	133,543
Stamford	92,713	107,907
Waterbury	107,130	106,431
Counties		
Fairfield	653,589	785,603
Hartford	689,555	808,246
Litchfield	119,856	141,066
Middlesex	88,865	114,148
New Haven	660,315	733,846
New London	185,745	220,037
Tolland	68,737	102,895
Windham	68,572	82,109

Source: (1970 Census of Population Preliminary Reports)

Increases during the '70's are expected to follow the already established pattern, with further outward growth from the major cities. Regionally, the heaviest concentration of population will continue to be in the urban belt from

Fairfield County through the South Central Region to the Capitol Region, with a sharp percentage gain expected in the Housatonic Valley Region. There will be noticeable gains also in the Southeastern Region.

Thus, a dense population corridor is building up along the Connecticut portion of the Boston-Washington corridor. Geographically, this population corridor borders Long Island Sound from the New York State boundary to New Haven, then extends northward beyond Hartford. Outside this broad spine, population clusters are also forming in the Naugatuck and Thames Valley areas.

More 18-24 year olds

The implications for higher education of the concentrations of population cannot be overlooked. Nor can the fact that the age of the population will decline substantially between now and 1980, with significant growth in the under-35 category. There will also be an increase at the older end of the scale, as these projections show:

Age Group	1960 (000)	%	1980 (000)	%	2000 (000)	%
0-14 years	747	29.5	915 *	26.7	1,582 *	30.6
15-24	306	12.1	538 *	15.7	736 *	14.2
25-44	706	27.8	920	26.8	1,354	26.2
45-64	535	21.1	687	20.1	991	19.2
65 plus	242	9.5	368	10.7	503	9.8
	2,536	100	3,428	100	5,166	100

*Midpoint between cyclical and straight projections shown in "working papers."

(Source: Higher Education in Connecticut, Vol. 1, Working Papers, U. S. Office of Education, December 1964)

Using a slightly different age breakdown, the Connecticut Labor Department estimates that there will be 381,000 in the 18-24 year old bracket by 1975. This is a reasonably firm figure, since most of these young people

are already attending elementary and secondary schools in Connecticut.

While most of the population increase will come from births, we can also expect substantial in-migration from other states and abroad. It is anticipated that the 1970 census will show Connecticut to have gained 150,000 to 200,000 residents from other areas during the decade just completed, and another 170,000 new arrivals can be expected in the '70's.

Change in the mix

Perhaps more significant than numbers, at least in the cities, is the change that is taking place in the demographic composition of some Connecticut communities.

In 1960, Connecticut was predominantly white, with only 4.4 percent non-white. The largest proportion of Connecticut's foreign stock was of Italian origin, 24.1 percent; the next largest segment--12 1/2 percent was from Canada, and third was Poland with 12 percent. Other national origins included the United Kingdom, 8.4 percent, Ireland, 7.7 percent, and Germany 6.6 percent.

Many of today's in-migrants are Black or Puerto Rican. The State Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities estimates Connecticut's present Black and Puerto Rican population at 8-10 percent of the total, or 240,000 to 300,000. In other words, this segment of Connecticut's population has more than doubled in the past decade.

In the college age group, 18-24, the New England Board of Higher Education anticipates a Black and Puerto Rican population in Connecticut of 33,500 by 1980.

This influx is most apparent in the cities where it is accompanied by an exodus of whites to the suburbs. For example, about one-third of Bridgeport's

population is black and Spanish-speaking Puerto Rican. In the public schools, 54 percent of the children come from these backgrounds (plus nearly 500 non-English-speaking Portuguese), yet only a handful of the professional staff belongs to any of these ethnic groups. One-third of all high school students drop out and few minority group students graduate. The unemployment rate of these unskilled young people tends to run double or triple the national average, expecially during periods of economic adjustment such as that experienced in 1969-70. This concentration of minorities in the cities is creating a disproportionate need for post-high school education in the large metropolitan areas.

Similar, though not identical population shifts are taking place in Hartford, New Haven, Stamford and elsewhere. How the elementary and secondary schools respond depends to a large extent on our institutions of higher education and in turn affects them tremendously. Problems include not only the numbers and qualifications of the students who apply for post-high school education, but also the type of teacher education that must be offered, the need to provide additional counsellors who can relate to minority groups and in the numbers of teachers who must be prepared to teach in the community colleges. The questions of admissions policy and equality of educational opportunity are particularly difficult and of concern at all educational levels. So are community relations.

These are some of the reasons why Task Force I felt it was unrealistic if not impossible to divorce its considerations of higher education from other phases of learning. Instead, we have chosen to look at higher education in the context of the total educational experience, from kindergarten through continuing adult education, but with emphasis on the post-high school

continuum.

How well educated

In 1960, the figures for the median number of years of school completed by Connecticut's adult population was 11.0 compared to 10.6 for the nation. The proportion of the school age population (five to 24 years old) enrolled in schools in Connecticut in 1960 was 75.9 percent, compared to 71.7 percent for the nation. In the same year 12.3 percent of the State's males 25 and over had completed four or more years of college. Among the 50 states, Connecticut is second in the number of Ph.D.'s per million population.

Many residents, however, got their degrees outside the State. The majority of holders of advanced degrees among New England's population, according to the New England Board of Higher Education, did not get their college education in New England.

As the level of education increases, studies show, so does the rate of migration and the distances covered. Thus, achieving a perfect balance between job needs and personnel educated to fill those needs can never be achieved within a state; this does not make the goal any less desirable.

Nationally, school enrollment in 1969-70 was 47.2 million compared to a figure of 36.1 million in 1959-60. In Connecticut, the public school enrollment was 676,000 compared to 481,029 pupils in 1959-60. In 1969-70, 117,409 persons were enrolled in the State's public and private institutions of higher education. Of this number 33,000 attended only part-time and more than 20 percent were enrolled in community college and technical college programs.

Total school and college enrollments in Connecticut, it is conservatively

estimated, will have grown to at least one million by 1980.

Out-Migration

Not all of Connecticut's high school graduates, however, attend colleges in the State. Of the 33,419 who graduated from public high schools in 1969, 69.2 percent planned to continue their education. Only 52.4 percent of the 13,886 attending four-year institutions, however, were enrolled in Connecticut institutions. And of those entering four-year programs, 40-50 percent will probably drop out before getting their degrees.

The number of out-of-state students enrolled in Connecticut colleges does not compensate for the out-migration. In the Fall of 1968, for example, 118,505 students whose homes were in Connecticut, attended degree-granting institutions, but only 63.7 percent or 75,525 remained within the State. Connecticut students attending institutions outside the State numbered 42,980. Since the gross in-migration of students was only 22,156, we see--by subtraction--that Connecticut experiences a net out-migration of 20,824. In 1963, five years earlier, this net out-migration was 13,018.

Transportation

Except for a few isolated instances, all students live within an hour commuting distance by car of a two-year community or technical college. Major highways provide relatively easy access also to the state colleges and universities, although complaints about lack of parking space are common.

The Connecticut Department of Transportation has tentative plans--depending upon the population growth, employment patterns and car registrations--to enlarge existing expressways, build additional connector highways and to add new routes. The Department's plans take into consideration the increasing

enrollments at the colleges and universities throughout the State, and the numbers of day students who come by car.

For students who must depend upon public transportation, higher education is less accessible. The Penn Central Railroad provides service between most of the large cities, including Hartford, New Haven and Bridgeport, and some of the towns located along the main lines. Getting from home to station without a car, or from station to campus, can be discouraging. Except for the New Haven-New York route the service is very limited.

Bus riding has declined since 1950, as the number of cars per family has increased. Most of the increase in bus registrations in the State--from 2,200 in 1945 to 3,900 in 1960--is attributed to a rise in the number of school buses for elementary and secondary school students.

As for local service, two bus companies--The Connecticut Co. and Connecticut Railway and Lighting Co.--operating in Stamford, Waterbury, Bridgeport, New Haven and Hartford, carry 87 percent of the passengers using local service. Availability of service for higher education students is limited due to dispersal of student residences and class schedules.

Personal Income

In 1968 personal income in Connecticut totalled nearly $13 billion, or $4,256 per capita compared to $3,417 per capita for the whole United States. In per household effective buying income, Connecticut ranked third among all the states in 1968, with $11,753 per household. Fairfield County, many of whose residents commute to New York City, is the most affluent.

In per capita expenditures for state institutions of higher education, however, Connecticut ranked 43rd among the 50 states in 1969, only a slight improvement from 47th place in 1965. The per capita amount for general

expenditures was $38.30 in 1969. Median expenditure for the country is $55.61.

The economy

Manufacturing--nationally and in Connecticut--is the chief single source of income. The service industries, however, are showing a much faster growth rate and by 1980, according to information compiled by the Connecticut Bank and Trust Co., the service industries will probably provide about 64 percent of the jobs in Connecticut, compared with 59 percent in 1968. Manufacturing will supply about 35 percent, and resource industries will offer progressively fewer jobs than their one percent in 1968.

The following projections of manpower needs, taken from the "Occupational Outlook Handbook, 1970-71" from the U. S. Department of Labor, gives the national picture:

Industries in which people work	1968 (mils)	1980 (mils)
Manufacturing	19.8	21.9
Trade, retail and wholesale	14.1	17.6
Government, state, local federal	11.8	16.8
Services	10.6	16.1
Transportation, Public Utilities	4.3	4.7
Agriculture	3.8	2.7
Finance, Insurance, Real Estate	3.4	4.3
Contract Construction	3.3	4.6
Mining	.6	.6
	71.8	89.3

A similar projection from the State's "Occupational Outlook, 1968-75" gives a comparable view for Connecticut:

Industries in which people work	1968 (thousands)	1975 (thousands)
Manufacturing	477.6	459.0
Trade	211.0	251.0
Service	158.3	208.0
Covernment	136.1	158.9
Finance, Insurance, Real Estate	66.8	75.9
Construction	51.4	58.8
Transportation & Public Utilities	50.3	49.6
Agriculture	14.4	12.0
All other (household workers, self-employed, unpaid family workers)	100.1	108.0
Total Employment	1,266.0	1,381.2

Boom in services

According to the Connecticut Labor Department's "Occupational Outlook, 1968-1975," the State will have about 400,000 job openings through 1975. Nearly 30 percent of them will be new positions.

Industry employment projections were predicated on moderate economic conditions and an end to the Vietnam war. The adjustment has already begun in the defense-oriented industries. Most of the reductions will be in manufacturing, with a substantial amount in the unskilled and semi-skilled classes although manufacturing will remain the largest single source of employment.

A net growth of more than 130,000 jobs in non-manufacturing is expected. This will include net gains of 40,000 in retail and wholesale trade, 22,800 in government and 49,700 in other services. Agriculture is the only field for which a net reduction is projected.

Some shifts in the occupational make-up of the labor force will take place also. Professional ranks, the fastest growing occupational group, will swell by over 36,000 workers, with total job opportunities amounting to 80,400.

The largest number of job openings, 107,000, will be in clerical occupations, with almost 31,000 new jobs added between 1968 and 1975. Service workers will show the strongest relative employment growth through 1975. By then, it is estimated that more than half of all professional and technical employment will be in the service industries concentrated in education and health.

A net expansion of 8,500 jobs for craftsmen and technicians is expected, with electronic technicians most in demand.

Many of the professional and technical jobs require college and graduate degrees. A number, which directly affect the health, education and welfare of the public, require the demonstration of proficiency and competency to a state licensing board.

Critical service occupations in which personnel needs are mushrooming are health care, education and municipal services.

Health care. There will be a continuing shortage, from doctors to janitors, and including all sorts of technologists and therapists with specialized skills. To deliver adequate health care over the next decade, Connecticut will require 60,000 new health workers, including 20,000 registered nurses, plus X-ray technicians, medical secretaries and hygienists, well beyond the number that can be trained with existing facilities and programs.

The 1970 Directory of Education and Training Programs for Connecticut Health Occupations lists more than 40 job titles. However, new jobs as yet undefined will develop as new modes for delivering health care develop.

As the authors of the Directory point out, the need is not simply to duplicate existing curricula but rather to establish totally new academic

programs or to restructure completely some existing programs.

For example, we aren't training enough paraprofessionals to assist doctors and dentists, although we know that quality health care can be extended to greater numbers when doctors delegate routine activities to aides and technicians and spend their own time on more skilled tasks. And surely further research will disclose other new patterns and efficiencies that will in turn require different training than is now given.

As evidence of the overall need, a 1970 report on medical care issued by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education calls for 126 new health centers in the United States, one or more to be located in Connecticut. The centers would relate medical training more effectively to the delivery of health care. The proposed reforms would cost the Federal Government a total of $1 billion by 1980.

Teacher training. The children born during the baby boom following World Wor II are grown up now. The need for teachers which moved from the primary grades to the secondary and college levels, is now limited to specialized areas.

In addition to replacement needs, there are urgent unfilled needs for bilingual teachers: teachers capable of establishing rapport with minority and disadvantaged younsters; teachers of vocational education and interdisciplinary subjects, such as environmental education.

The Federal Environmental Quality Education Act of 1970 aims to strengthen the resources for environmental education by making grants to institutions of higher education for developing, testing and evaluating new curricula and for training teachers in their use.

Government. Over the long-term, need for employees is exceeding supply

in all types of municipal service, including city and town management, planning, zoning, housing, urban renewal, traffic management, law enforcement, health, recreation, environment and social welfare.

Lack of hard data

These examples illustrate some of the general employment trends that are creating challenges for higher education. Other jobs, as yet undefined, are bound to appear during the next decade or two. But specific data are hard to come by.

We had hoped to be able to recommend academic needs based on detailed, longer range projections of occupational needs, but we found the data simply are not available. Some areas, where we know the needs are great, as health and social welfare, are like icebergs. Most of what we need to know about them is below the surface. This data must be compiled--by CHE, the Labor Dept., or perhaps by a college or university under contract to the State--before we can decide on relevant educational programs. We recognize that this is an extremely difficult task but it should be attempted.

Not only are the State's manpower needs changing; so are the aspirations of individuals. Increasing numbers are demanding a chance for higher education. More ways must be found, however, to encourage the aspirations of minority groups, and new mechanisms must be established to help them recognize and develop their full potential.

New England has a long tradition of excellent private education--preparatory schools and Ivy League colleges. The area, however, is less well equipped to satisfy the emerging needs for public education than are many of the midwestern states and western states whose large state universities and land grant colleges have, for generations, made a college education available to all residents

who sought it.

Connecticut's public institutions are not fully meeting this need at present. Yet there is economic as well as social justification for doing so. College graduates earn as much as 60 percent more than non-graduates in 40 years, much of which will be returned to the State's economy through retail sales, taxes and growth in business and industry.

To find ways to make higher education available to all those who want and can profit by it, without sacrificing the quality of that education, is one of the concerns to which Task Force I has addressed itself.

III. ENROLLMENT

A number of trends in higher education are easy to discern.

. An estimated 8.2 million students enrolled at the nation's colleges and universities in the fall, 1970, nearly three times the enrollment in 1955.

. Connecticut's share--exclusive of the Coast Guard Academy which is federally supported--is 126,230, an eight percent increase over the preceding year 1969.

. Nationally, more than half of those who complete high school enter college.

. In Connecticut, in 1969, 69.2 percent of the graduates of public high schools went on to some form of higher education. While the percentage for private schools is not available for 1969, it is undoubtedly higher than for public. In 1968, for example, 91 percent of the graduates of private high schools went on to some form of higher education: 70 percent to a four-year college, 12 percent to a two-year college and nine percent to some other type of institution. Earlier projections had indicated that 80 percent of the graduates of public high schools will be seeking post-high school education by 1975. About half of those who enter institutions of higher education will probably stay to complete the program undertaken.

In 1970, about 58 percent of the students attending Connecticut colleges are enrolled in publicly supported institutions, compared to 56 percent in 1969. The main rise--nearly 4000 students or over 20 percent in one year--was in the two-year public institutions, including both the community and technical colleges. The only drop in enrollment occurred in the two-year private institutions. The increase, however, in the four-year private institutions

was slightly more than a thousand, or only 2.5 percent.

The following table shows the increase of 1970 enrollments over 1969 for both full and part-time students in all programs in both the public and private institutions in Connecticut.

Opening Fall Enrollments

A Head Count of All Students Enrolled in Connecticut Colleges

	1969	1970 *	Gain	Gain %	Projected 1980	Gain Over 1970 %
4-year public	46,872	51,584	4,712	10.0	74,700	44.8
4-year private	48,721	49,888	1,167	2.4	55,000	10.1
Sub-total	95,593	101,472	5,879	6.2	129,700	27.8
2-year public community	12,339	15,762	3,423	27.7	37,500	137.9
2-year state technical	5,924	6,453	529	8.9	8,600	33.3
2-year private	2,628	2,543	-85	-3.2	3,200	26.1
Sub-total	20,891	24,758	3,867	18.5	49,300	99.1
Federal--Coast Guard Academy	925	969	44	4.8	1,000	3.2
	117,409	127,199	9,790	8.3	180,000	41.5

* As reported to CHE on November 15, 1970.

Among the 180,000 students in 1980, there will be 101,000 full-time equivalent students supported by appropriations from the State General Fund.

Rising enrollments to continue

There will be no letup in the number of youths seeking post-secondary education during the next decade. The only question is: How many of the students presently attending Connecticut's elementary and secondary schools

will choose to continue their education and what type education will they want? In view of the rising aspirations of large segments of the population, accurate projections are difficult.

Arthur D. Little,Inc. in its April,1970 "Suggested Plan for Developing Connecticut's Community College System" estimates that by 1985 a potential 62,000 to 72,000 students will be seeking entrance for full-time and part-time study at Connecticut's regional community and technical colleges. Present institutions cannot accommodate this number.

Admissions Requirements

The University of Connecticut generally draws its student body from high school graduates who have been in the top half of their class. The State colleges draw from a somewhat wider base, considering each applicant on an individual basis but accepting primarily students who are academically in the upper 50 to 60 percent of their high school graduating classes.

Anyone with a high school diploma or its equivalent can enroll for a degree program at one of the ten community colleges, if space is available. Acceptance for the most part is on a "first come, first served" basis.

Entrance to a particular program, such as allied health studies, is more selective. Students are screened to determine their general aptitude and their previous preparation, with screening procedures fairly standard at each of the community colleges. If not admitted to the program of his choice, however, a student may take other courses.

Persons without a high school diploma may take courses, but to enroll for credit toward a certificate or an associate degree, students must have a high school diploma or its equivalent.

Technical college students must be high school graduates with an aptitude for mathematics and science, and an interest in becoming technicians in industry and engineering. Those who do not qualify on the aptitude test may be admitted to a one-year pre-technical program to prepare them for full enrollment. About 40 percent continue on to a four-year college for a B.S. degree, receiving up to two years of transfer credit.

About 20 percent of the third year transfer students at the University of Connecticut come from the community colleges, compared with only five percent three years ago. They are given first preference among all transfer applicants; a total of 130 were offered admission in 1970.

At the State Colleges, spaces are also available in the third-year level for students who have successfully completed two years at a community college.

Open enrollment for Connecticut?

"The Connecticut Extended Educational Opportunity Program Committee," a subcommittee of CHE, points out that Connecticut has no statewide policy on enrollment. Each institution establishes its own admissions policy. However, 23 out of 33 institutions responding to a survey indicate that they have special admission standards for disadvantaged students and others.

On the basis of its investigations, the Extended Educational Opportunity Program Committee made two basic recommendations which Task Force I endorses:

1. That existing extended educational opportunities programs at the separate, individual institutions be encouraged and supported financially.

2. That CHE coordinate these separate programs, define the most appropriate roles for institutions, and establish a statewide plan with the public two-year institutions as the key institutions.

We understand this to mean that admission to higher education for those who do not meet conventional admissions standards will be facilitated by compensatory and remedial programs, concurrent with their enrollment at a college, and leading to qualification for admission to a degree program.

The four-year institutions have initiated such programs and we think they should continue. The major portion of compensatory and remedial work, however, should be a responsibility of the community colleges, where much is already being done.

To the extent that "open enrollment" means an opportunity for those who don't have the conventional qualifications to benefit from remedial programs and gain access to a collegiate program, we endorse it. We object, however, to "open enrollment" when it signifies automatic entrance to a degree-granting program for all who have attended high school, regardless of their scholastic readiness.

We assume a need for constant re-examination of admission standards by each institution.

Two-thirds of Connecticut's institutions of higher education are accepting students to whom they must give special or remedial courses to qualify the students for regular programs. The technical colleges offer pre-entrance courses in mathematics and science, and do not admit students into the regular program until they qualify. The community colleges require placement examinations of all degree students. If a placement test indicates serious deficiencies, the student is required to take one or more non-credit remedial courses.

We suggest that to be more effective the educational system as it is now structured should provide some sort of transitional education between high

school and college. Alternate learning centers in high school to help students who are having difficulties might be one answer.

It is to be hoped that the gap between the secondary and college levels will diminish as elementary and secondary schools meet the needs of all students better.

Another issue as difficult to resolve as open enrollment is how to make it possible for students to move in and out of programs easily and meaningfully. There must be greater leniency for transfer from a two-year to a four-year program and from a vocational to an academic track, to allow students--or those who have been working for some time--to change their career paths or to take some enrichment courses with a minimum loss of time and credits.

A positive step in this direction was taken in November 1970 when the Task Force on Transfer of the CHE recommenced that all Connecticut institutions granting the bachelor's degree agree to accept in transfer credit earned by examination and awarded to students in the two-year colleges in the State, provided:

1. that such credit is awarded on the basis of duly recognized and nationally standardized examinations, and

2. that such credit is supported by information as to local norms for such examinations.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

Because socio-economic needs are all-pervading, touching virtually every aspect of higher education, Task Force I found it especially difficult to decide on which areas to focus its recommendations.

Our primary goal referred to previously as the basic assumption from which all our discussions proceeded, is that Connecticut should provide opportunities for post-high school education to all residents who want it and have displayed some evidence -- through academic records, test scores or counseling -- that they have the potential to benefit from higher education. Neither cost nor geography should be barriers. Benefits of participating in some form of higher education may be economic or cultural, or both, according to the choice of the individual student.

Equally important, we feel, is the goal of accelerating change in our institutions of higher education, in the type of education they deliver and in the ways in which they deliver it.

In general, our recommendations follow rather closely Charges One through Five, Category A, of the Task Force I Assignment, and the implications of those Charges. We have tried to suggest actions that higher education, especially the Commission for Higher Education, can take in response to socio-economic trends -- national, state and regional. In cases, such as Charge C-2, where it was impossible within the limitations of time and information available, to recommend direct action, we have asked for further study.

In a search for structures to assure academic freedom, right of dissent, and continuity of learning in higher education in Connecticut,

(Charge A-6) we have endorsed some of the recommendations made previously by several outstanding and capable commissions. We have also made a few recommendations of our own; for the most part, our approach has been to delineate an attitude or philosophy that we feel may be timely.

In deciding upon courses of action for Connecticut, we ask that the Commission for Higher Education consider the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1. SPEEDING UP INNOVATION

Find ways to encourage the timely introduction of innovations into the curriculum and into methods of operation and techniques of teaching of the colleges and universities, at least on a pilot basis.

The slowness of change in educational institutions is one of the chief causes of student disaffection. We are not suggesting innovation for innovation's sake, but we do point out that there is a lag in training for various fields and that some institutions are not producing graduates who are up-to-date.

Educators tend to study proposals and problems for years without acting upon or even experimenting with solutions and new approaches. We must find ways by which at least a segment of each institution can stop studying and start implementing, and we must devise ways to get adopted on a wider scale those projects which prove effective. Often programs do not get implemented on a long-term basis even after they have been tested and found good.

We suggest, for example, that Connecticut try some variation of the University Without Walls, described to us by Dr. Samuel Baskin, president of the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities at Antioch.

"We've got to tear ourselves away from the concept that the classroom is the only place to get an education," Dr. Baskin said. "Let's think of new models and organizational structures that will do a better job in higher education."

This approach is similar to that of the Parkway Program in Philadelphia, a high school without walls that uses the community's facilities -- its businesses, industries, YWCA's and museums -- as classrooms, and whose courses are often taught by persons connected with these institutions rather than by professional teachers.

This is the sort of alternative to traditional methods that we would like to see tried in Connecticut.

Recommendation 2. MORE CHOICES FOR STUDENTS

Provide young people with more options for post-high school experience.

Higher education admittedly is being sought and demanded increasingly by the public at large and by employers as a condition for employment. This climate must be tempered.

1) Not everyone should feel he must go to college in order to succeed. Full value of vocational training, work experience and other options must be realized.

2) For those who do seek post-secondary education, the variety of choices must be enlarged.

We must initiate means for easier entrance, transfer and re-entry to the education system, with minimum loss of credit and without stigma to those transferring from one program to another, or alternating work and school, or sampling both vocational and academic programs.

Task Force I feels that the limitations imposed by college programs have resulted in much student dissatisfaction with resultant unrest among students. There needs to be more experimentation with unconventional programs that combine practice and theory.

Recommendation 3. INCREASED ACCESS TO EDUCATION

Adopt and promote the concept of education as a unified lifetime experience to be facilitated by the State's overall education system.

Connecticut residents should be able to move through the system easily, entering any phase of it which they want and are ready for, without being stopped by unnecessary requirements or other barriers. They should receive adequate counseling, as needed, as to what they can and cannot expect to achieve by taking a certain program. From preschool onward they should encounter a minimum of delay to continuing their education.

In light of this concept, we suggest that CHE study the possibility of letting students, with counseling, plan their own programs according to their individual interests and sample courses at several cooperating institutions rather than registering at one college. Such a program might be set up regionally, with qualifying tests given by a state agency according to requirements established by the cooperating institutions, somewhat like an external degree program (see Recommendation 8).

Recommendation 4. ACCESS TO EDUCATION FOR WOMEN

Provide more opportunities and encouragement for women to be educated for the professions, government and service jobs, as well as technical positions.

To provide equal access to education for women will mean readjusting schedules and course loads, providing day care centers, and other changes in the traditional educational structures. Since there will be fewer children in K-12 schools, and therefore fewer openings for elementary and secondary teachers in the next decade, it is imperative that women enter other fields in larger numbers. Many of them want to, but more education will be needed to compete for available jobs.

The U. S. Labor Department study "U. S. Manpower in the 1970's" predicts that by 1980 there will be 37 million women working (twice as many as in 1950). One indication of the job market for women is a recent survey by David Pinsky of firms employing 16,206 technicians. Of these only 710, or 4.4 percent, were women. Of the employers surveyed, however, 71.1 percent said they are willing to use women as technicians, while 12.2 percent said they would not.

There appears to be surprisingly few women in higher education. A survey conducted by the American Association of University Women finds clear evidence that women do not have equal status with men in the academic world. Less than 9 percent hold the rank of full professor, and 21 percent of the schools reached had no women trustees, while 25 percent had only one.

A step in the direction of broadening the scope of education for women might be to encourage the appointment or election of more women trustees to institutions of higher education.

Recommendation 5. AVOIDANCE OF UNNECESSARY DUPLICATION

Avoid setting up new programs that will duplicate those in existence at near-by institutions or that will put neighboring institutions into unnecessary

and wasteful competition with each other.

This could happen if institutions do not coordinate their responses to the demand for additional programs in management training, allied health and other fields.

A viable alternative would seem to be for each of the several colleges to offer one or more specialties, and make this expertise available to students at other institutions within the State on an exchange basis (either student exchange or exchange of visiting professors).

Another alternative is the consortium or cooperative approach. There are reportedly about 1,000 educational consortia in America now. In Connecticut, three public two-year colleges are the principal cooperating partners in establishing a higher education center in Waterbury. They are Mattatuck Community College, the Waterbury branch of the University of Connecticut, and the Waterbury State Technical College. Post Junior College, a private institution, is also participating.

Recommendation 6. FULL USE OF PRIVATE FACILITIES

Explore ways of achieving broad, general cooperation between public and private institutions, especially those located near each other, as in the major urban areas of New Haven, Bridgeport, and Hartford. The goal: to offer an adequate range of programs with a minimum of duplication and a maximum of economy. A consortium or other voluntary working arrangement between two or more institutions is one means. Contracting between the State and private institutions is another.

If it becomes apparent that it is more economical for the state to contract with a private institution to provide a program than it would be

for the state to duplicate the same program, and the private college is close enough to the constituents so it will work no hardship on them to attend, then CHE should encourage such academic cooperation through proper financial support.

Every effort should be made, under such contractual arrangement, to preserve the quality, uniqueness and flavor of the private institution while serving the public.

Recommendation 7. USE OF COMMUNITY RESOURCES

Encourage the use of community resources off-campus, including libraries, museums, parks, municipal services, businesses and industries (and their personnel) to augment the resources of higher education.

Not only will this approach expand the colleges' resources; it will also give students and faculty greater involvement with the community and add to their theoretical knowledge some practical experience as to how businesses and other organizations and institutions operate.

Recommendation 8. EXTERNAL DEGREE

Encourage one college or university in the State to experiment with an external degree program (requiring little if any attendance on campus), as recommended by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, and evaluate the program's effectiveness as an educational approach that should be more widely adopted. Since TV may well be one ingredient of such a program, the newly organized "Connecticut Higher Education Television Association," of which 31 colleges and universities are charter members, may provide one excellent way to implement the external degree.

Any program such as this that allows students to take courses with

a minimum of supervision and possibly at more than one institution (see Recommendation 3) will require an effective method of quality control. One method would be to establish standards of evaluation and give examinations regionally or statewide, much as certification is given to nurses and other professions with agreed-upon standards for performance.

A well-developed multi-media program that makes it possible to earn a college degree with less emphasis on campus attendance may well win private and foundation support.

Recommendation 9. PREPARING FOR JOB ADAPTABILITY

Emphasize preparation for broad work categories or clusters of jobs rather than for specific jobs.

Higher education has a responsibility to prepare students with a broad base of knowledge and skills that can be applied to a number of jobs within a given field. There are many positions in the health field, for example, that require common knowledge and skills. A group of junior colleges reports considerable success in retraining unemployed aerospace engineers and technicians to work in the field of environmental control.

Having the problem-solving ability and the flexibility to apply one's skills to more than one type of employment becomes more important all the time. Rapid technological change is a big factor. So are social and economic changes, including the difficulties of making accurate job projections for any long span of time.

The ability to shift out of positions that become obsolete and into new jobs is one of the most important benefits higher education can give

its students.

Recommendation 10. UPGRADING THE IMAGE OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Increase understanding of the objectives and philosophy of vocational education.

We must deepen appreciation for the idea that creativity can be expressed by means other than words. Vocational or occupational education should be seen in proper perspective as one aspect of education, not necessarily final or exclusive of other types of education. This broader attitude will lessen the stigma on vocational education and the pressure on all students to take an acedemic course. It must be communicated, through an intensive, continuing effort, to teachers and counselors, to parents, and to the staffs of the four-year liberal arts institutions.

Recommendation 11. LIBERAL ARTS AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Encourage the community and technical colleges to offer more general education courses, while at the same time elevating craftsmanship and manual creativity to a proper place in the educational hierarchy.

The ideal education would be a mix of liberal arts and vocational skills, with varying degrees of emphasis depending upon a person's life goals. Making a sharp distinction between the two, however, is no longer valid. Vocations cannot be treated just as vocations; a plumber is involved with sanitation, with health, with environment. He needs to appreciate the social and cultural aspects of life, not only as they relate to his work but also for self-fulfillment and enrichment.

We should encourage students to seek greater diversity in the courses they take by making more electives available, including more opportunities

for academic students to take courses in applied fields.

Recommendation 12. EXPANDED TRAINING FOR COUNSELORS

Extend the training of counselors in contemporary approaches to counseling, including the use of the computer as a counseling tool.

To achieve this, we recommend that the following programs be implemented:

1) A statewide program to disseminate to counselors, parents, students and others up-to-date and forward-looking information on developing job needs, new technologies, new career opportunities, knowledge and skills for which there is or is going to be high demand.

2) A cooperative program with the Department of Education to institute counseling in the elementary grades.

3) A pilot program to train counselors for the elementary and secondary schools with emphasis on helping students evaluate the options open to them, making them aware of the consequences their early decisions have on later educational and job opportunities, stressing the growing importance of interdisciplinary education and the widening opportunities for application of liberal arts education to the solution of social problem.

4) An in-service training program for teachers and counselors already employed in the elementary and secondary schools.

5) A series of seminars on counseling sponsored by CHE to keep secondary school personnel informed about existing and planned educational opportunities in Connecticut.

6) Special seminars to help counselors assist those whose present aspiration may exceed their current capabilities or whose aspirations are not high enough; on the proper use of job projections in counseling; on academic vs voca-

tional education, and other areas of decision.

Teachers and counselors who function primarily with minority students must become more sensitive to their lack of vocational and career exposures and their need for continuing experiences related to career appreciations.

Recommendation 13. INFORMATION SYSTEM FOR COUNSELORS

Strengthen, expand and update counseling services and make them available to all segments of the population whether or not they are currently enrolled in school or college.

To accomplish this, we recommend the following:

1) The establishment of regional counseling and testing centers open to the public.

2) A study of the feasibility of using a computer service to provide counselors with up-to-date data on job projections, educational requirements for various institutions, and other pertinent information.

3) An examination of the feasibility of setting up and utilizing a statewide matching system -- a central clearing house not associated with any particular college -- as an adjunct to personal counseling.

A computer could provide a preliminary match-up of student qualifications and preferences with the profile of measurable characteristics and requirements of the state's institutions of higher education, both public and private, four-year and two-year. This would show at which institutions each applicant stands the best chance of acceptance.

Such information would be followed up by realistic personal counseling, including in-depth interviews with those who want to change direction or who want to enroll for a program of study for which they are seemingly unprepared.

Recommendation 14. ADMISSIONS AND PROGRAM REVIEW

Appoint a study team, representing the business, academic and civic sectors, to review that admissions requirements and programs of the State's institutions of higher education in light of the revisions taking place in job requirements and personal expectations.

The purpose of the study would be to stimulate revision of requirements that are unnecessarily demanding and restrictive, such as admissions requirements that may be arbitrary or unrealistic or the insistence on B.A. or B.S. degrees for positions that can be handled effectively by paraprofessionals, and to initiate the upgrading of programs in fields where present training is found to be inadequate.

In evaluating admissions and program requirements for timeliness and relevancy, caution should be excerised not to overlook the broad cultural and social values that education should provide.

Recommendation 15. RECOGNIZING POTENTIAL

Give incentives and encouragement to institutions for the acceptance of a certain number of students who do not satisfy existing requirements for admission but who give differential evidence of their potential.

New techniques for assessing potential must be found. While selection criteria are being revised, students who evidence through counseling a strong desire for higher education and a determination to prove their ability to benefit should be given an opportunity.

Institutions should be ready to offer whatever special services some of these students may need for educational success. Their performance should be evaluated continually so that guidelines for screening candidates can be revised

and new admissions requirements developed. Each institution should share its experience with others, so that the successful approaches can be tried and perhaps adopted generally.

The Community Colleges especially should offer the major opportunities for education for large numbers (See discussion of open enrollment, p. 30). Institutions which fail to recognize and develop the potential of students or which fail to demonstrate understanding of the process for developing potential should be offered the services of a pool of consultants with expertise in this area.

Recommendation 16. ONGOING STUDIES OF NEEDS

Carry on, in conjunction with other agencies, as appropriate, research and planning on a continuing basis to

1) Examine job projections for both long-range and short-range implications for education.

2) Examine socio-economic trends, especially in relation to characteristics of Connecticut.

For the minority student, it is especially important that courses have both immediate and long-term career value. Courses related to employment, when completed, should be recognized by employers for advancement purposes. In addition, most courses should incur credit toward a certificate, a diploma or a degree.

3) Review faculty and curriculum, to see that the offerings suit the needs.

Recommendation 17. PARAPROFESSIONAL CAREER LADDER

Encourage Connecticut's institutions of higher education to work out a program

to recognize paraprofessional workers' capabilities and to help them get further education while still working.

Paraprofessionals in teaching, health, child care, and other fields have demonstrated their ability. They should be encouraged to continue their education, perhaps on a released time basis, while still working and be given the opportunity to advance as their skills improve.

A "career ladder" system serves several groups:

1) the professionals, who are freed of routine duties so that they can devote more time to their specialties;

2) the public, in that better teaching and health care, for example, are made available to larger numbers;

3) the paraprofessionals themselves, who find new ways to get into the job market and to advance.

Recommendation 18. EXPANDED CONTINUING EDUCATION

Expand programs in what is commonly called continuing education so that there will be more suitable courses, including but not limited to those carrying degree credit.

Offer continuing education courses at more locations, so that existing facilities and faculties will be used to advantage for those who cannot carry a full-time, day-time program leading to a degree.

For the minority student, it is especially important that courses have both immediate and long-term career value. Courses related to employment, when completed, should be recognized by employers for advancement purposes. In addition, most courses should incur credit toward a certificate, a diploma or a degree.

This thrust for more and better continuing education should be accompanied by an ongoing public relations effort:

1) to promote acceptance of the concept that education must be a continuing experience throughout a lifetime rather than a terminal experience confined to a specific period in one's life;

2) to encourage flexibility and adaptability so that persons can apply their skills to more than one career or profession as needs change;

3) to educate business and industry to the concept of general education for a group of jobs, to the advantages of hiring personnel whose capabilities are transferable, and to the desirability of additional training for employees so that they can shift from one job activity to another.

4) to strive to assure equal opportunity in the employment of minority persons as administrators, teachers, counselors in positions which relate to all students, as well as those from minority groups. The lock-out of minority individuals at certain employment levels is reflected in their decisions as to the feasibility of continued education.

Recommendation 19. LIAISON WITH ALL LEVELS

Initiate closer working relationships with agencies in the State concerned with elementary, secondary, vocational and continuing education, so that the effects and counter-effects of policies and practices at one level will be fully understood by the others and can be coordinated for the benefit of the students where feasible.

This recommendation stems from these convictions:

1) That, if Connecticut is to achieve the goal of educating each citizen to the extent that he can benefit, greater attention must be paid to the inter-

relationships of all levels and types of education and their effects on each other;

2) That what happens in K-12 has profound effect on a person's opportunity for additional education, and

3) That, conversely, the policies of admissions, degree requirements and other positions taken by Connecticut's institutions for higher education, as well as the training given teachers and counselors of the K-12 schools, influence -- sometimes irrevocably -- what happens in the elementary and secondary schools.

Recommendation 20. FACULTY SERVICE CORPS

Encourage the establishment of a voluntary Faculty Service Corps to take a year's leave of absence to work in community service, in field projects, in overseas teaching or in other practical service positions.

In such roles, faculty members would be close to social and economic needs. They could update their knowledge and skills, gain a new orientation toward changing technologies and occupational fields, develop an increased awareness of the need for an interdisciplinary approach to many of today's problems, while making a tremendous contribution to the people and communities with whom they work.

Faculty members who avail themselves of this opportunity for service should be required to teach for a certain period of time after their return in order to share with students their firsthand experiences. This plan would be a partial answer to students who say they are too often taught by graduate students instead of regular faculty.

Such a program might lead to a plan suitable for Federal sponsorship where-

by the United States would lend faculty in fields where enrollment is declining -- for example, agriculture, mining, home economics -- to emerging countries where teachers of those skills are much in demand. If this became a national effort, it might be advisable to set up a National Registry to match up Service Corps volunteers with needs.

Recommendation 21. EXPANDED RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES

Begin encouraging minority group members as early as kindergarten, to think of education as continuing education.

This is necessary in order to make minority children fully aware and appreciative of education for self-development.

In the middle schools serving minority youngsters, special programs should be inaugurated to give students greater career awareness.

In secondary school, the diversity of programs offered to minority youth must be increased if their learning behavior is to be relevant to career choice and educational intent.

Recommendation 22. INCREASED SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

Offer increased supportive services to students who are excluded from educational advancement because of family financial problems and related pressures.

Counseling services must include viable relationships with health and welfare agencies. The objective is to free the student of family concerns so that he can avail himself of opportunities for personal development.

V. STANCE ON STUDENT UNREST

While many of our recommendations take into account the desires of students for alternative approaches to higher education, we also want to address ourselves directly to the question of student unrest and outline a stance for Connecticut that we feel may be workable.

Our basic recommendation is that educators and legislators should focus on clearing up causes of student unrest, rather than on formulating additional legislation for dealing with student demonstrators. Present laws are sufficient to protect the colleges and the people, and to insure due process for students. No additional legislation is needed. We suggest that administrators make sure students understand existing laws and then stand firm on them.

What the record shows

Most Americans take a dim view of the incidence of unrest on American campuses in the last decade. Recent polls indicate that the public judges campus unrest as the second most critical problem confronting the nation ("law and order" being first). A second measure of the intensity of concern is the increasing number of reports on the topic issued by governmental and private agencies.

Twice in the past year the President of the United States has commissioned investigations on campus unrest. Task Force I's Subcommittee on Student Unrest has found these documents invaluable in its investigations. From them and from our research, including conversations with students, we have endeavored to arrive at recommendations for assuring "academic freedom, right of dissent, and continuity of learning in higher education in Connecticut."

It is important to note that, statistically, not all campus dissension was

accompanied by violence. In recent years, approximately three-fourths of America's colleges and universities experienced either no protests at all or only peaceful protests. Violent protests involving property damage or personal injury occurred on fewer than seven percent of all campuses. Statistics also indicate that only a small number of students have been involved in violent or unlawful protest; large numbers of students, on the other hand, are deeply concerned about campus conditions and the "system" in general.

To get a clearer picture of the nature and extent of campus unrest and disruption in Connecticut, we examined information obtained on questionnaires distributed by the Commission for Higher Education to publically supported colleges in the State. The responses reflect national trends.

Most schools experienced some demonstration of student opinion about national and local issues. For the most part, the protests were peaceful and within the bounds of dissent protected by the First Amendment, such as picketing and boycotts They occurred in the community colleges as well as in the four-year institutions (no report from the technical colleges).

Although there were a number of direct confrontations in the four-year institutions, they consisted largely of brief classroom disruptions, short building take-overs, and, in one instance, the painting of a building. As has been found nationally, the percentage of students taking an active part in demonstrations is small, only one to three percent on the average, with a considerably higher involvement in the community colleges. In specific incidents, however, as high as 70 percent of the student body may vote support. There were only two reported instances of classes being cancelled at Connecticut institutions.

It is also important to note that where dissent exceeded the bounds of proper conduct -- at Central and Southern Connecticut Colleges -- police were called and

students were disciplined by suspension or expulsion. Connecticut has been fortunate, however, in the relatively low intensity of student activity so far. Damage has been minor.

Causes

The sources of tension may be divided into two types of issues -- those that are internal or campus-related and those related to external events.

Off-campus issues. In this category, the predominant issues are the Indo-China war, racism, economic inequities, and the youth culture, which is characterized in the Scranton Report as a generational rejection of the perceived values of the establishment, i.e., "materialism, competition, rationalism, technology, consumerism and militarism."

It should be recognized, however, that the spectrum of student opinion on the issues is wide. At one extreme, some students favor the war; others oppose it, not merely as a tragic mistake but as a predictable indication of imperialist aggression fostered by the "military-industrial-educational complex."

Most students reject both extremes. Yet they are deeply concerned about the continuation of the war and the inability of government to meet the pressing needs of society. A study reported by Professor Kenneth Keniston of Yale in May, 1970, indicated that 75 percent of American college students believe that "basic changes in the system will be necessary" to improve the quality of life in America. Only 19 percent think the country "is currently on the right track."

The question at this point is: Why do students lash out against the universities in protest against national governmental policies? Some students perceive R.O.T.C. programs, Defense Department contracts for research, and on-campus recruitment by the military and defense-related firms as an indication

of university complicity in the "war-machine."

For the majority of students, however, most displays of dissatisfaction with external events are not directed at the university. During the national student strike in May 1970 students on many campuses were anxious to make clear that the strike was not a strike <u>against</u> the university, but a strike against governmental policies. Students are not necessarily seeking to politicize their institution when as members of a community they express a political opinion.

<u>Internal issues</u>. Dissension directed at external issues many times turns into an internal cause. The classic example: students protesting the war are disciplined by the university, after which the disciplinary process becomes the next issue of protest.

Issues not associated with external causes, however, are common sources of campus tension. Nationally, the American Council on Education (Linowitz) reports the issue of student power was catalytic in 77.9 percent of the incidents involving violence and in 74.7 percent of the non-violent protests that occurred in 1968-69. In a national survey of colleges which experienced disruption last spring, the Scranton Commission found that representatives of both faculty and student body mentioned internal causes more often than external.

Internal issues which give rise to dissent may be divided into two categories: those which concern student life, i.e., parietal rules, and those which concern academic affairs and institutional governance.

Parietal rules pose less of a problem from year to year. The doctrine of "in loco parentis" has been eroded almost to the vanishing point, removing this responsibility from the universities. Most dress codes have been abolished and curfews, if they exist at all, are lenient. Students have come to focus their attention on university governance and academic affairs.

Governance.

Since most academic changes inevitably involve administrative decisions, it is convenient for purposes of analysis to group all major internal concerns as issues of institutional governance.

As the primary objects of policy decisions, students feel that they should have a role in policy setting. The extent of the involvement desired varies from campus to campus: on some, students are calling for a voice through representation on committees; on other campuses, students are demanding the power of voting membership on governing boards. Given a voice or power, students aim to influence decisions about required courses, relevancy of curriculum, quality of teaching as affected by tenure, due process and discipline, grading, research policy, recruitment practices and institutional commitment to public service.

The above are some of the major, dramatic issues which may give rise to student expression of dissatisfaction and frustration. In reality, few if any incidents have a single cause. On each campus a unique combination of multiple causes and events leads to the eruption of active protest.

Task Force I agrees with the Scranton Report's conclusion (which was also the thesis of an article by Kenneth Keniston and Michael Lerner in the November 8 issue of The New York Times Magazine): any simplistic explanation of campus unrest is invalid. Many groups must share the responsibility.

Solutions.

Now that we know some of the reasons why campus unrest exists, the real problem is what to do about it. Several possible solutions might be suggested.

Adequate laws. Many states as well as the Federal government, have attempted to deal with student unrest by enacting new laws and new statutes, most of which

are punitive or repressive in nature. This approach should be discouraged; it is superficial and counter-productive. It penalizes actions without seeking out the causes that underlie such actions. Existing statutes are sufficent for the punishment of offenders and the protection of society.

It cannot be denied that a small segment of students are attempting to use the university as a springboard for political revolution. This type of student is, however, unrepresentative. His prime grievance is not with the campus but with the total political and social system. It is important that the public should not condemn the entire student body and educational institutions because of the extremist attitudes and activities of a limited few.

We must not overlook a significant fact, however; as long as poverty, hunger, pollution, racism, and militarism are not ameliorated from the system, the more moderate students will be tempted to join forces with the revolutionary.

Academic reforms. Dismissing the enactment of new laws and statutes as the best solution for campus unrest, the committee turned to a consideration of some solutions that may be worked from within the academic community....

First of all, universities must make every effort to involve students in the decision-making process for policies that affect them.

The objection to a student on the board of trustees -- on grounds that such representation will lack continuity or will not truly represent the student body -- may be overcome by inviting younger and larger numbers of alumni to serve as trustees.

Certainly mere token representation is to be avoided, but if the objective is communication between various members of the university family, then it would seem wise to risk the danger of tokenism. Participation of students in committee

activity should be encouraged, but trustees and administrators must make certain that the committees have significant responsibility and authority. Otherwise, student representation on committees can be counter-productive.

In anticipating and dealing with campus ferment, there is probably no substitute for the "visible" administrator who is available to students and their representatives and who is willing to come to grips with problems as they arise. Some Commissions have recommended the creation of "rumor centers" and use of ombudsmen in the interests of developing prompt communication and keeping lines open constantly. This type of procedure is highly desirable, but must be developed to suit the needs of the individual institution.

In some cases, electing a faculty member to the board of trustees may be advisable. If a faculty member is disqualified for membership on the grounds of conflict of interest, the faculty point of view can be invited by electing a trustee from the faculty of another university.

Matters of curriculum and teaching constitute the most sensitive nerve center of student unrest. Trustees, administrators and faculty all have assigned areas of authority. The fourth element in the academic structure -- the student body -- is without authority, without representation and without a voice in determining the effectiveness of his teachers, the content of his courses, and the distribution of studies in which he must engage. Viewed in this light, a case can be made for the most flagrant neglect of the consumer. Should not the student, having attained maturity, be privileged to participate in the selection of his own instructional diet and have something to say about the competency of those who prepare it?

There is another ingredient to the problem. Many young men and women attend college for non-intellectual reasons. They are there because of parental pressure,

draft avoidance, job requirements, because attending college is the thing to do or because this is a way to postpone entering the labor market.

For the unmotivated student, the curriculum cannot fail to be a source of boredom and frustration. The availability of only the limited traditional academic education may be part of the problem. The distinction between academic and vocational education may be another. It should be possible to eliminate this distinction and to develop a curriculum that blends the two concepts.

Recommendations of Others, Reviewed

Task Force I, through its subcommittee on student unrest, has examined in detail the following studies by national groups:

The Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest (Scranton Report) September 1970.

Campus Tensions: Analysis and Recommendations, Report of the Special Committee on Campus Tensions (Linowitz Report, published by the American Council on Education) 1970.

Heard Report. Statement by Alexander Heard, Chancellor, Vanderbilt University, on completion of his mission as special advisor to the President, July 1970.

Report of the American Bar Association Commission on Campus Governance and Student Dissent.

We endorse a number of the recommendations made in these reports. Abstracts of those suggestions which we believe might improve the atmosphere on Connecticut's campuses follow. They are grouped according to the audience to whom they are directed, and the source from which each recommendation is drawn is indicated in parenthesis. Additional sources listed indicate reports which may contain substantively similar recommendations.

To the President of the United States.

Exercise reconciling moral leadership as the first step to prevent violence and create understanding. (Scranton, Heard)

#

Seek to convince public officials and protestors alike that divisive insulting rhetoric is dangerous. (Scranton)

#

Take the lead in explaining to the American people the underlying causes of campus unrest and the urgency of our present situation. (Scranton)

#

Renew the national commitment to full social justice, and be aware of increasing charges of repression. Take steps to see that the words and deeds of government do not encourage belief in those charges. (Scranton, Heard)

#

Lend personal support and assistance to American universities to accomplish changes and reforms. (Scranton, Heard)

#

Take steps to assure that (the President) be continuously informed of the views of students and Blacks. (Scranton, Heard)

#

Call a series of national meetings to foster understanding among those who are now divided. Meet with governors, with university leaders, with law enforcement officers, and with Blacks and student leaders. (Scranton, Heard)

#

Welcome young people into the political and governmental processes. (Heard)

#

Provide additional student aid funds immediately to economically disadvantaged students. (Heard)

To the Department of Defense

Establish alternatives to R.O.T.C. so that officer education is available to students whose universities choose to terminate on-campus R.O.T.C. programs. (Scranton)

To the Governors of the States

Hold meetings and develop contacts throughout the school year to further the cause of reconciliation. (Scranton, Heard)

#

Be sensitive to the charge of repression and fashion words and deeds to refute it. (Scranton, Heard)

To Government Officials

Recognize that public statements can either heal or divide. (Scranton)

#

Increase financial support of higher education, including aid for Black colleges and universities. (Scranton, Linowitz, Heard)

#

Support the continuing efforts of formerly all-white universities to recruit Black, Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, and other minority students, and provide them with adequate student aid. (Scranton, Linowitz, Heard)

#

Enact strict controls (federal and state) over the sale, transfer, and possession of explosive materials. (Scranton)

#

Make plans (state and local) for handling campus disorders in full co-operation with one another and with the universities. (Scranton, American Bar Association)

#

Establish (state) guidelines setting forth more precisely the circumstances that justify ordering the Guard to intervene in a campus disorder. (Scranton, American Bar Association)

To Law Enforcement Agencies

Train and equip peace officers to deal with campus disorders firmly, justly and humanely and to avoid uncontrolled and excessive response. (Scranton)

#

Develop joint contingency plans among law enforcement agencies. Specify which law enforcement official is to be in command when several forces are operating together. (Scranton, Linowitz, American Bar Association)

#

Use shoulder weapons (except for tear gas launchers) only as emergency equipment in the face of sniper fire or armed resistance. (Scranton)

#

Give National Guardsmen more training in controlling civil disturbances. (Scranton)

#

Issue to the National Guard special protection equipment appropriate for use in controlling civil disorders. (Scranton)

To the Universities

Improve the capability for responding effectively to disorder. (Scranton,

American Bar Association, Linowitz)

#

Be an open forum where speakers of every point of view can be heard. The area of permitted speech and conduct should be at least as broad as that protected by the First Amendment. (Scranton, American Bar Association, Linowitz)

#

Promulgate a code making clear the limits of permissible conduct and announce in advance what measures will be employed in response to impermissible conduct. Strengthen the disciplinary process. Assess the capabilities of security force and determine what role, if any, that force should play in responding to disorder. (Scranton, American Bar Association, Linowitz)

#

Call promptly for the assistance of law enforcement agencies when criminal violence occurs on the campus. (Scranton, American Bar Association, Linowitz)

#

Make teaching programs, degree structure, transfer and leave policies more flexible and varied. (Scranton, Linowitz)

#

Reaffirm that the proper functions of the university are teaching and learning, research and scholarship. (Scranton, Linowitz)

#

As institutions, remain politically neutral, except in those rare cases in which their own integrity, educational purpose, or preservation are at stake. (Scranton, American Bar Association, Linowitz)

#

Reduce outside service [research] commitments. (Scranton, Linowitz)

Take steps to decentralize or reorganize to make possible a more human scale. (Scranton, Linowitz)

#

Reform governance systems to increase participation of students and faculty in the formulation of university policies that affect them. (Scranton, Linowitz, American Bar Association)

#

Draw faculties and staff members from more diverse social and vocational backgrounds. (Linowitz)

#

Try novel admissions practices, both to extend access to higher education and to provide a broader population in which to test the quality and effectiveness of education programs. (Scranton, Heard, Linowitz)

#

Review regularly, with legal counsel, practices regarding such matters as the confidentiality of information about students and the privacy of student living quarters. Review also provisions for due process in disciplinary proceedings. (Linowitz, American Bar Association, Scranton)

#

Ensure that avenues of communication are open. (Linowitz, Scranton)

#

Recognize effective teaching in hiring, promoting, and paying, especially in the major institutions. (Linowitz, Scranton)

#

Reappraise tenure policies. (Linowitz)

#

Get greater diversity in board membership of age, occupation, and other salient individual characteristics that might broaden horizons and present other points of view. (Linowitz)

#

Respond more effectively to the educational desires of women and eliminate sex discrimination wherever it exists. (Linowitz)

#

Pay more attention to the needs of ethnic minorities. Ultimately incorporate ethnic studies into regular academic programs so that the white majority will learn more about the history and needs of minority groups. (Linowitz, Heard)

#

Recruit more students, faculty, and staff from minority groups that are underrepresented in the campus population. (Linowitz, Heard)

To Students

Accept the responsibility of presenting their ideas in a reasonable and persuasive manner. Recognize that they are citizens of a nation which was founded on tolerance and diversity, and that they must become more understanding of those with whom they differ. (Scranton, Linowitz, American Bar Association)

#

Protect the right of all speakers to be heard even when they disagree with the point of view expressed. (Scranton, Linowitz, American Bar Association)

#

Face the fact that giving moral support to those who are planning violent action is morally despicable. (Scranton)

#

Realize that language that offends will seldom persuade. (Scranton)

#

Do not expect (their) own views, even if held with a great moral intensity, automatically and immediately to determine national policy. (Scranton)

#

Match (their) rhetorical commitment to democracy with an awareness of the central role of majority rule in a democratic society, and by an equal commitment to techniques of persuasion within the political process. (Scranton, Linowitz, American Bar Association)

#

Understand that, as institutions give up policies of in loco parentis, students cannot be effectively shielded from the consequences of their behavior, especially when it violates the laws of society at large. (American Bar Association, Linowitz)

Posture for Connecticut

In addition to citing the above national recommendations which we find applicable to Connecticut, Task Force I has also formulated some recommendations of its own for assuring academic freedom, right of dissent and continuity of learning in the State.

#

Because in the search for learning the status quo is a point of departure, it is to be expected that the university community will be several strides ahead of conventional ideology. This posture should be encouraged and defended by trustees, administrators, faculty, students and alumni.

#

Prevention, rather than the handling of confrontations and crises when they occur, should be emphasized. Institutions make the mistake of waiting until challenged, then responding defensively, rather than iniating procedures for change before the students initiate demands. These change procedures should be set up on a continuing -- not simply an ad hoc -- basis. Continual review and adjustment -- a tightening here and a loosening there -- is indicated.

#

The colleges and universities need to study what is happening in society at large in order to anticipate what students will do next. Much of what has been happening on campus could have been predicted if educators had done a better job of analyzing the socio-economic trends as they developed. Some of the consequences could have been forecast. The effects of emphasis on civil rights, T.V., the youth culture might have been expected to result in the rising expectations of minorities, the earlier maturing and sophistication of youth, and in changing life styles. Resistance to the old-style dormitory life, parietal rules and traditional education was inevitable. A few institutions -- but too few -- reacted and began to experiment with new modes of learning and governing. Most didn't. Perhaps the best lesson educators can learn from the events of the past decade is to assume leadership and direction or have it wrested from them.

#

Response to campus unrest should be sensitive.

The Scranton report has defined three categories of disorderly campus protest: <u>disruption</u> -- occupation of buildings, interference with all legitimate institutional activities unaccompanied by violence or terrorism; <u>violence</u> -- willful injury to property or person, physical assault, destruction of records and similar criminal activity; <u>terrorism</u> -- organized and systematic use of violence

in the nature of bombing, arson, and use of lethal force.

Each of these categories warrants a different kind of administrative response. While terrorism necessitates that the police be called in promptly, disruption on the other hand should be dealt with by more restrained tactics.

When it appears likely that communication and negotiation will not contain a volatile situation, recourse to the civil courts by the way of injunctive proceedings is recommended.

#

University policy, rules, and guidelines for proper conduct should be definitively stated and made known to all members of the community.

#

Student discipline should be enforced effectively and fairly.

All disciplinary proceedings should ensure academic due process including the following guarantees:

The hearing should be timely and speedy.

Notice of charge and information as to the nature of the evidence should be furnished the accused.

The hearing should be before a fairly selected panel of faculty and students, with a member of the administration presiding.

While strict courtroom procedures are not required reasonable guidelines as to the competency of testimony and an orderly hearing should be established.

The student should have the right of representation by counsel or advisor, as should those presenting the charges.

There should be the right of confrontation of accusers and witnesses, and of cross examination.

Whenever an issue is of special significance, or is exceptionally delicate

or complex, a competent outside hearing examiner may be called in to hear the case.

There should be a right of appeal and review by the university president or a panel presided over by him.

#

If the nature of the offense is such that the student's presence on campus is offensive or threatens orderly university procedures, interim suspension is warranted, but in such a case the hearing should be held most promptly.

#

Each institution should be encouraged to have at least one "visible" administrator who is available to students and their representatives and can come to grips with problems as they arise.

#

Students must be allowed greater participation in the selection of their own instructional diet -- in the content of courses, the distribution of studies and the effectiveness of teachers.

#

A trustee who is a faculty member at another university should be elected, if faculty members are considered to have a "conflict of interest" when serving on the board of the institution at which they teach.

#

More young alumni should be urged to serve as trustees.

#

Student participation on committees should be encouraged, particularly at institutions where student membership on the board of trustees is felt to be impractical.

#

Committees on which students serve should have significant responsibility and authority.

#

Political leaders must make an effort to become better acquainted with student bodies, faculties and administrations.

#

Enactment of new laws and statutes that are punitive or repressive in nature is to be avoided. This response to student unrest is superficial and counter-productive as the major studies unanimously agree. Existing statutes are sufficient and adequate for the punishment of offenders and the protection of society against violence.

#

Condemnation of the student body in general or any particular college or university because of the extremist attitudes and activities of a limited few is unjustified.

#

If a criminal offense has been committed, resulting in the arest and prosecution of a student, university disciplinary proceedings, while not absolutely necessary may be held without charge of double jeopardy. However, internal proceedings should be deferred until after criminal proceedings have been concluded.

#

All student related records maintained by the university, whether gleaned from the student or from external sources, should be deemed confidential and not be released to any outside agency, governmental or otherwise, unless such release is specifically required by court order or authorized by the student.

Authorization by the student is assumed in the case of release of grades in connection with a transfer on behalf of the student.

#

Alumni should be informed regularly and like trustees, should be encouraged to support administrators in achieving the institution's objectives without resort to confrontation and force.

#

Keeping in mind the three categories of disorderly protest -- disruption, violence, and terrorism -- it must be constantly remembered that orderly protest is protected by the Constitution and that students are entitled to the same First Amendment freedoms that they hold as citizens.

#

In conclusion, we would point out again the interdependence of the colleges with other segments of the education system. The cure for student unrest cannot be accomplished within the university structure alone, since the university population is fed by secondary school graduates whose frustration may already have begun before they enter college. This is one of the reasons we recommend better and earlier counseling, and closer liaison with the secondary school leaders, and college training for teachers and guidance officers in modern, realistic counseling practices.

APPENDIX A

SECTION I - CREATION OF TASK FORCES

> The CHE has the need by law and logic for the development of a plan which, subject to annual or systematic modification, could represent at any one instant the synthesis of policy, objectives and the fiscal and physical plans for meeting those objectives. (Robert J. Jeffries, Chairman, Fiscal Policy Committee of the Commission for Higher Education. Statement to Commission, May 7, 1970.)

As a way of implementing quality planning the Fiscal Policy Committee of the Commission for Higher Education recommended establishment of four task forces whose general responsibilities would be:

(a) identification and collection of pertinent data,

(b) definition and consideration of alternative proposals, and

(c) identification of alternatives.

In addition, it was stated that,

> Each task force will be encouraged to address itself not only to those specific responsibilities initially assigned to it but also to those which it identifies as a result of its own activity. In a time when higher education programs are being expanded rapidly, and when increasing demands are being placed on our institutions of higher education, a static charge to a task force would be unrealistic and would fail to utilize the anticipated potential of the group.

Membership of each task force was to consist of five to fifteen members to be drawn from higher education (administration, faculty, students), business and commerce, the professions, state agencies and communities. The Commission for Higher Education was to provide staff assistance.

Two basic areas of concern were directed to the attention of each of the Task Forces. These included long-range and short-range matters which were described as follows:

Category A - Long-Range Concerns are related to the sequential development of the State's system of higher education both public and private.

Category B - Short-Range Concerns are related to those items mandated by the 1969 General Assembly which must be completed for presentation at the time of the convening of the 1971 General Assembly. Some studies may also be completed by special committees and in-house activities of the Commission for Higher Education and can be integrated with the pertinent concerns of the task forces.

The four major topics of concern delegated as assignments to each of the task forces were identified as being consistent with the goals of the Commission for Higher Education after consultation with the constituent boards of the higher education system and the Advisory Council of the Commission for Higher Education, representing public and private institutions of higher learning in Connecticut. The areas are I. Needs: Socio-Economic, Manpower, and Regional; II. Function, Scope, and Structure of Higher Education; III. Financing Higher Education, and IV. Qualitative and Quantitative Performance and Achievement in Higher Education.

It is expected that the summer and fall deliberations of the four Task Forces may result in recommendations for Legislative action as well as the identification of possible new directions in Connecticut higher education.

SECTION II - HIGHER EDUCATION IN CONNECTICUT

In 1964, the United States Office of Education, at the request of a commission appointed by the General Assembly, conducted a study of higher education in Connecticut. The recommendations made in that report led in 1965 to the creation of a state system of higher education, a definition of the role of the higher education subsystems including the Commission, the establishment of a Community College system.

The Commission's efforts, since its inception, have been directed toward the significant and orderly development of the system, avoidance of costly and inefficient duplication of programs and coordination in introduction of programs and institutions to serve the needs of the state and its citizens. A major responsibility carried by the Commission is to determine the needs of higher education in the State and how they can best be met through the total higher education system and the subsequent sponsoring of legislative programs and levels of support that will best meet these needs.

Goals for higher education in Connecticut have been identified by the Commission after extensive discussions with the constituent boards of the public higher education system and the Advisory Council. They include the following:

1. To plan for and to coordinate higher education in the state and to stimulate among the constituent units of the public system and the independent colleges, long-range planning which will result in economically efficient and functionally effective programs of education.

2. To define, collect, and analyze data which are related to higher education and carried on by the staff of the colleges and universities in the State; and to report and communicate the aims, needs, and achievements of higher education in the State.

3. To make recommendations which will assist all colleges and universities in the State in obtaining the faculties, facilities, programs, and financial support which they must have to provide quality education.

4. To participate in the development of educational standards and to test college performance in relation to these standards.

The Commission published and distributed general goals defining long-range objectives for public and private higher education institutions in the State. These are:

1. To insure that no student in Connecticut who is qualified or qualifiable and who seeks higher education be denied the opportunity for such education because of his social, ethnic, or economic situation.

2. To protect essential freedoms in the institutions of higher education.

3. To provide opportunities for a liberal education and for preparing to serve the State's economic, cultural, and educational development.

4. To develop the most effective use of available resources in public and independent institutions of higher education and thus obtain the greatest return on the public investment.

5. To maintain quality standards which will insure a position of national leadership for Connecticut's institutions of higher learning.

6. To assist in bringing the resources of higher education to bear upon the solution or abatement of society's problems.

The Commission for Higher Education is one of the five subsystems in the Connecticut system of public higher education. It acts with Boards of Trustees of the other four subsystems to coordinate planning and to assist in their relationship with agencies whose activities affect higher education. It is the desire of the Commission for Higher Education to achieve the proper balance between institutional autonomy and coordinated operations. Generally speaking the mission of each of the four subsystems

can be explained as follows:

Regional Community Colleges

The present State system consists of 10 community colleges. The first three colleges were founded by the interest and efforts of community leaders. Subsequently Public Act 330 made possible the incorporation of these three colleges into a Regional Community College system and provided for the establishment of additional two year community colleges.

> They have a responsibility to offer courses of instruction for academic credit leading to the associate degree. In addition to programs of study for college transfer, this level of instruction includes career oriented programs designed to prepare individuals for the variety of specialized vocations that the growing complexity of Connecticut's economic environment demands. In addition, the responsibility of the Regional Community Colleges extends to the offering of courses of instruction at the transitional level for high school graduates preparing for work at the degree-credit level. Such offerings at the transitional "pre-freshman" level include courses of retraining, continuing education, and community services.
>
> The role of the community college pre-supposes service to a region within commuting distance of its student clientele. Each of the institutions expects to provide facilities to support instructional, cultural and extracurricular programs normally available in a comprehensive college of medium size. Dormitories, however, are not envisioned. (Board of Trustees, 1968.)

Norwalk and Manchester established community colleges without State assistance in 1961 and 1963. Winsted made plans for a community college to open in September of 1965. Following incorporation of these three institutions into the Regional Community College System, guidelines for the further development of a community college system for Connecticut were developed by the Commission for Higher Education when it was established in 1965 by the State Legislature.

Additional colleges added to the system and recommended for approval by the Commission for Higher Education included:

Housatonic Community College Stratford	Licensed 3/1/67 to begin 9/67
Middlesex Community College Middletown	Given independent status 6/1/68
Greater Hartford Community College Hartford	Licensed 5/10/67 to begin 9/68
South Central Community College New Haven	Licensed 5/10/67 to begin 9/68
Mattatuck Community College Waterbury	Licensed 5/10/67 to begin 9/68
Tunxis Community College Bristol - New Britain	Opened in 9/70
Mohegan Community College Norwich - New London	Opened in 9/70

Three additional community colleges, not recommended by either the Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges or by the Commission for Higher Education were authorized in the closing days of the 1969 session of the General Assembly. These were:

Northeastern Connecticut	To open after September, 1971
Northern Connecticut	To open after September, 1971
Ansonia - Bridgeport - Derby Region	To open after September, 1973

State Technical Colleges

Four State Technical Colleges were developed in the postwar years. Publicly-supported technical college education in Connecticut dates back to April, 1946, when the Connecticut Engineering Institute was organized in Hartford by the State Board of Education. Inaugurated as a pilot program in response to demands of Connecticut industry, the institute was to help

fill the need for a new type of industrial personnel, the engineering technician. The Connecticut Engineering Institute functioned as a post-secondary institute for several years. Following the success of the program in Hartford, other institutions were founded in Norwalk (1961), Norwich (Thames Valley, 1963), and Waterbury (1964). A fifth institution was authorized by the 1967 Legislature for the greater New Haven area. By legislative action in 1967 (P.A. 751) the name was changed from institute to college, a separate board of trustees was established and the system became a subsystem of the public system of higher education in 1965.

> The purpose of these institutes is to prepare those technicians for immediate employment in Connecticut industry who need up to two years of college-level instruction. (Board of Trustees, 1966)

State Colleges

Four State Colleges were created as normal schools in the years between 1850 and 1903. Degree granting privileges were extended in the 1930's and the names changed to State Teachers Colleges. In the 1960's, the institutions added graduate programs and additional curricula. Subsequently their names were changed to:

Southern Connecticut State College in New Haven

Central Connecticut State College in New Britain

Eastern Connecticut State College in Willimantic

Western Connecticut State College in Danbury

> As multi-purpose institutions of higher learning, the State Colleges recognize four interrelated functions: professional education, liberal education, graduate study and research, and public service.
>
> The major emphasis of the colleges is and will continue to be given to the professional preparation of teacher

> and other school personnel. Professional offerings have been extended to include education of nurses and the liberal arts and sciences program has increasingly grown in importance offering majors in the areas of the humanities, mathematics, the social sciences, the physical sciences, and the life sciences. (Board of Trustees, 1968)

University of Connecticut

The University of Connecticut was created by the Legislature in April, 1881, as the Storrs Agricultural School. Charles and Augustus Storrs, natives of Mansfield presented the state with a gift of 170 acres of land and $6,000. In 1893, the General Assembly renamed the school Storrs Agricultural College and offered admission to women. Three other name changes occurred: Connecticut Agricultural College in 1899, Connecticut State College in 1933 and the University of Connecticut in 1939.

At present the University has five lower division branches in Waterbury (1946), Hartford (1946), Stamford (1951), Torrington (1957) and Groton (1967). The Legislature provided for the expansion of Stamford to a four year college division by September of 1971, although this proposal was opposed by both the University and Commission for Higher Education. No funds were specifically appropriated for this purpose.

Schools of Law, Social Work and Insurance have been created in Hartford. In 1961, a Medical-Dental School and Health Center were authorized in Farmington. Although the facility is still under construction, the first class of 48 students was admitted in September, 1968. When facilities have been completed, and full classes admitted, 48 doctors and 48 dentists should be graduated annually.

> The University of Connecticut is charged with 'exclusive responsibility for programs leading to doctoral degrees and post-baccalaureate professional degrees.' The University must additionally provide undergraduate, pre-professional,

first professional, and Master's degree work consistent with its particular responsibility for advanced graduate study, and such extension and service programs as are appropriate to the training and characters of its staff and to its facilities.

The central point of emphasis of current planning efforts of the University is an institution of highest quality, with an internally complementary graduate and undergraduate program, on a scale that reconciles the requirements of quality with the state's quantitative needs. (Board of Trustees, 1965)

Commission for Higher Education

As the fifth subsystem in Connecticut's system of higher education, the Commission for Higher Education functions to coordinate planning of the other four subsystems and assists in their relationships with agencies whose activities affect higher education.

In carrying out its mandated responsibilities, the Commission for Higher Education attempts: (1) to secure for the State a maximum return on its investment in higher education, (2) to extend higher education opportunity for the State's citizens, (3) to create new resources to meet emerging higher education needs, (4) to provide information and assistance to higher education boards, institutions, and agencies and (5) to create a climate for the orderly development of the State system of higher education.

Under the provisions of Public Act 330, the Commission for Higher Education has 16 members, 12 appointed by the Governor and four appointed by the subsystem boards. Of the 12, one must be a representative of the State's private institutions of higher education.

Members presently serving on the Commission who were appointed by Governor John Dempsey are:

Chairman
Donald H. McGannon, President
Westinghouse Broadcasting Company
90 Park Avenue
New York, N. Y. 10017 (1975)

John J. Driscoll, President
Connecticut State Labor Council
AFL-CIO
9 Washington Avenue
Hamden, Connecticut

The Reverend Edwin Edmonds
Dixwell Avenue Congregational Church
217 Dixwell Avenue
New Haven, Connecticut 06511 (1971)

James F. English, Jr., Chairman
Connecticut Bank & Trust Company
1 Constitution Plaza
Hartford, Connecticut 06115 (1971)

Miss Anne M. Hogan
23 Tatem Street
Putnam, Connecticut 06260 (1975)

Miss Helen M. Hogan
306 Greenbriar Drive
Cheshire, Connecticut 06410 (1973)

Dr. Robert J. Jeffries
The University of Bridgeport
219 Park Avenue
Bridgeport, Connecticut 06602 (1977)

James J. Dutton, Jr., Attorney
22 Shetucket Street
Norwich, Connecticut (1973)

John R. Reitemeyer, Publisher
The Hartford Courant
285 Broad Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06101 (1977)

Orville J. Sweeting
108 Everit Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06511 (1977)

Sister Mary Theodore
Mercyknoll
243 Steele Road
West Hartford, Connecticut 06117 (1977)

Alfred W. Van Sinderen, President
Southern New England Telephone Company
New Haven, Connecticut 06410 (1973)

The four representatives named by the subsystems are:

Merline D. Bishop
UAW - Sub-Regional Director
100 Constitution Plaza, Suite 500
Hartford, Connecticut 06103
(Rep. Board of Trustees,
University of Connecticut)

Henry E. Fagan
35 York Street
Stratford, Connecticut 06497
(Rep. Board of Trustees for
Regional Community Colleges)

Dr. Margaret Kiely
250 Myrtle Avenue
Bridgeport, Connecticut 06604
(Rep., Board of Trustees, State
Technical Colleges)

Mrs. Bernice Niejadlik
Alexander Lake (Box 304)
Danielson, Connecticut 06239
(Rep., Board of Trustees, State
Colleges)

Alternates named by the institutions:

Alternate for Mr. Bishop
Mr. Joseph R. McCormick, President
The Hartford Electric Light Co.
176 Cumberland Avenue
Wethersfield, Connecticut 06109

Alternate for Dr. Kiely
Mr. Charles Phelps
Hebron Road
Andover, Connecticut

Alternate for Mr. Fagan
Mrs. William Sale Terrell
2801 Albany Avenue
West Hartford, Connecticut 06117

Alternate for Mrs. Niejadlik
Mr. John F. Robinson
The Robinson School
17 Highland Street
West Hartford, Connecticut 06119

Alternate for Mr. Fagan
Mr. Justin Glickson
202 Ponus Avenue
Norwalk, Connecticut 06850

The Commission does not operate the public institutions of higher education. This function is assigned by statute to the various Boards of Trustees. Its responsibilities include a number of major coordinating efforts of which the following are examples:

Budget Planning and Coordination

Public Act 330 requires the governing board of each subsystem to prepare a biennial budget request and to submit it to the Commission for Higher Education, together with such additional information as required. The Commission for Higher Education prepares a consolidated proposed budget for submission to the Governor and the General Assembly. Since the requests of the governing boards of the subsystems are included in the Commission's submission, the Commission's recommendations represent an additional assessment of individual subsystem and total system needs. In the past two biennia, the total amounts recommended by the Commission for Higher Education have fallen between the amounts requested by the subsystems and those appropriated by the General Assembly. The Commission, in both biennia, recommended an amount for

each subsystem which it believed would provide for orderly progress and development, and an increment for improvement of quality as well.

Approval of New Programs

Since 1965, the Commission has been responsible for coordinating planning for higher education throughout the State. The Commission encourages individual governing boards to initiate plans for institutional development. The institutions are required to submit such plans to the Commission for approval. All institutions of higher learning, public and private, have participated in and profited by the many studies of educational needs and existing programs that the Commission and other organizations have made.

Beyond its coordinating role, the Commission is also responsible for accrediting new programs. This activity is carried out in cooperation with the Connecticut Council for Higher Education and serves to insure the public of the quality of the programs offered.

The Commission also has leadership and coordinating responsibilities in programs for student financial assistance, in contracting for spaces for Connecticut residents in independent institutions, and in developing higher education centers.

Independent Institutions

There is also a growing list of areas of cooperation between the State system and the independent colleges. These institutions, while not officially part of the publicly supported State system, enroll a substantial portion of the college students in the State. They are faced with the necessity of planning for the future in a time when public institutions of higher education are undergoing rapid expansion and development. The Commission for Higher Education

provides information to these institutions, involves them in planning activities, and makes every effort to insure that their contribution to the State will be maintained.

The first attempt by the Commission to seek greater utilization of independent colleges resulted in the enactment of P.A. 627 in 1969. This act provides that additional places in independent Connecticut colleges may be provided from public funds through contractual agreements with individual colleges. According to the law, the amount of money per contracted place paid to the independent colleges shall not exceed the cost to Connecticut for educating a student in a comparable program in the public system. The act stipulates that 125% of the current tuition charged by the institution to students, up to the cost per student in State supported institutions, be paid to the college for each additional Connecticut student it admits over a certain base year. The college agrees to use 100% of the tuition to Connecticut students in the form of financial assistance. The remainder may be utilized for its general expenses. The total appropriation made available for 1970-71 was $1,500,000.

With a grant from the Commission for Higher Education, An Analysis of the Financial Crisis of Private Colleges and Universities was completed in October, 1970 by Ward S. Curran, Associate Professor of Economics and George M. Ferris, Lecturer in Corporate Finance at Trinity College. The report was presented to the Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges for their consideration, and future developments are anticipated as a result of cooperative efforts between the Commission for Higher Education and the Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges. A blue ribbon committee has been created by the Commission to provide counsel and advice to the consulting

firm of Arthur D. Little, Inc., of Boston, as that firm studies the State's relationship to the independent colleges and universities within its borders. Efforts to preserve the viability of the private sector of higher education will be continued by the Commission for Higher Education as it recognizes the important contributions of the independent colleges and universities in Connecticut education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Caffrey, John, Editor. The Future Academic Community. American Council on Education.

Eurich, Alvin C., and the Staff of the Academy for Educational Development. Campus 1980: The Shape of the Future in American Higher Education. Delacorte, 1968.

REPORTS

The Academy in Turmoil, First Report of the ((New York State)) Temporary Commission to study the causes of campus unrest. February 1, 1970.

Black Consciousness and Higher Education. The Church Society for College Work, 1968.

Campus Tensions: Analysis and Recommendations. Report of the Special Committee on Campus Tensions, Sol M. Linowitz, Chairman. American Council on Education, 1970.

Connecticut 2000, an industrial projection. The Connecticut Bank and Trust Co.

The Connecticut Economy to 1980. The Connecticut Bank and Trust Co.

Connecticut Market Data, 1970. The Connecticut Development Commission.

Directory 1970 Education and Training Programs for Connecticut Health Occupations. Connecticut Commission for Higher Education and Connecticut Regional Medical Program.

Directory 1970 Education and Training Programs for Connecticut Health Occupations, Part III: Manpower Supply 1968-71. Connecticut Commission for Higher Education and Connecticut Regional Medical Program. (unpublished)

The Economy. Connecticut Interregional Planning Program, The State of Connecticut, 1966.

Higher Education in Connecticut, Report of a Survey by the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. December 1964.

Occupational Outlook, 1968-75. Connecticut Labor Department.

Occupational Outlook Handbook, 1970-71. U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Report of the American Bar Association Commission on Campus Government and Student Dissent.

The Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest. William W. Scranton, Chariman. September 1970.

Statement by Alexander Heard, Chancellor, Vanderbilt University, on completion of his mission as special advisor to the President. American Council on Education, July 1970.

A Suggested Plan for Developing Connecticut's Regional Community College System. Arthur D. Little, Inc. April 1970.

"Violent Social Conflicts in the Universities," remarks by John P. Spiegel, M.D., Director, Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence, Brandeis University, to the Conference on Campus Relationships. December 22, 1969.